



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
JUL 16 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

#2852
#13 Response
w/attach
Bong
7/17/03

APPLN. OF: SAKUMA et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/074,961
FILED: February 13, 2002
FOR: CIRCULAR-SHAPED METAL STRUCTURE, METHOD ...
GROUP: 2852
EXAMINER: ROBERT B. BEATTY DOCKET: AMANO A275 DIV

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

AMENDMENT C (REMARKS ONLY)

Dear Sir:

This amendment is being filed in response to the Official Action mailed April 8, 2003.

REMARKS

In rejecting the claims as anticipated by or obvious from Hori et al, the Examiner refers to certain physical properties the Hori et al structure has in common with the instant claimed structure. However, the Examiner ignores other limitations. Specifically, Applicant's claimed structure is a spinning worked structure, while Hori et al is a product formed by electroforming, more specifically, electroplating. A spinning worked product as claimed is structurally different, from a product made by electroplating. That is to say, as is well known to those skilled in the art, a product formed by "spinning working" which is a form of plastic-working, is structurally and different from a product formed by "electroforming." Moreover, a spinning worked product has a higher resistance to fatigue breakage than a product formed by electroforming. The inventors conducted an experiment to demonstrate the difference.

HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
130 W. CUSHING ST.
TUCSON, AZ 85701
TEL. 520.882.7623
FAX. 520.882.7643

175 CANAL STREET
MANCHESTER, NH 03101
TEL. 603.668.1400
FAX. 603.668.8567